

Date: Sat, 12 Jun 93 04:30:17 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #185
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 12 Jun 93 Volume 93 : Issue 185

Today's Topics:

Blind VE's (3 msgs)
Blind VEs
NQOI PRB-1 Loss
The Case in Question

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 20:26:13 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!
ennews!enuxva.eas.asu.edu!shandrow@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Blind VE's
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Like I said, noone is perfect. I messed up and duped this article. I'm
very sorry for that. However, this does not in any way detract from its
contents.

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 23:26:28 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Blind VE's
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dana H. Myers (dana@fafnir.la.locus.com) wrote:

: Hey, this topic has strayed from the rules and is now a flame war (a polite
: flame war, but a flame war) over a non-amateur subject. Might I suggest
: that it best be carried out in provate e-mail, or on alt.radio.amateur.flame?

OK I give!

1) Why is discussion of FCC regulations and the ability/legality
of blind hams to act as VE's not proper fodder for r.r.a.policy?

2) Since when has a rec.moto reader been against a flame war, even polite
ones? careful or I'll turn you in to DOD! :-)

3) What kind of ride do you have?

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                            *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

Date: Sat, 12 Jun 93 03:50:24 GMT

From: usc!wupost!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!
prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!dana@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: Blind VE's

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun11.202613.29623@ennews.eas.asu.edu> shandrow@enuxva.eas.asu.edu
(Darrell B Shandrow) writes:

>Like I said, noone is perfect. I messed up and duped this article. I'm
>very sorry for that. However, this does not in any way detract from its
>contents.
>

After all the zealous banter and strident militancy you've treated us
to, are you certain sending a duplicate article does not in *some* way
detract from your points?

;-)

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 11 Jun 1993 23:03:57 -0500
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!thumper.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Bill, WB9IVR wrote in article # 1570:

>
>so how about making a proposal about how a VE would work with a blind member
>to the FCC such that this whole argument is cleared up?
>

Certainly the blind will talk to the FCC before any other action is taken. This is the first step, and is sometimes the **only** step that is required to resolve situations like this.

>screaming "racism" isn't going to get anyone anywhere.
>

None of the posts that I've written, and none of the posts that I've read have accused anyone of racism. To do so would be counterproductive in my opinion. Racism has only been referred to in its analogous sense, to illustrate what has appeared to some to be a similarity between outdated views concerning the capabilities of the blind, and outdated perceptions of the abilities of people of color. This was done not to garner sympathy. Rather it was done to aid our fellow amateurs to better understand our position on this whole issue.

Let me say at this point that I agree with Mike Freeman, that there have been more than a few cases where the specter of racism has been raised when nothing of the kind was present. People should be judged on their own merits and not treated favorably due to a difference from the existing majority. We do not seek special privilege, merely the privilege to use the techniques that we have to serve our fellow amateurs.

>The FCC wants a flat management structure for the exam system. Adding
>unaccredited people (human readers) probably won't cut it with them. This was
>set up such that the amateurs themselves would be running their own exams.

>

This is a point that we've been making. With our alternative techniques (which include live readers) we are quite capable of administering, and being in charge of testing sessions.

Whether the reader is unaccredited or not is irrelevant. Live readers are a reasonable accommodation for the blind. This is supported by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended. This is federal law, and therefore will have to "cut it" with the FCC. In fact, I'd be willing to bet anyone a cold cheeseburger that there are blind persons working for the Commission at this very moment who use live readers. Just one thing. If I loose the bet, please, no McDonald's (TM) cold cheeseburgers. B-)

>Let's get down to details here. Let's not forget that if a blind VE is just
>as good as a sighted VE, then we should be able to take it to the limit and
>have an entire exam conducted by only blind VEs. Make that case workable
>to the FCC.
>

I'm certain that this could be done with little problem. After all, blind schoolteachers and University Professors have been giving exams to sighted students (with and *without* live readers) for decades.

But blind VEs alone shouldn't be singled out for this sort of test of their abilities. I'm in complete favor of competence, and even excellence being shown by VEs. In fact I believe that all of us in the service should *demand* such. Therefore if the FCC wishes to test the strengths of VEs then by all means let them do so. But let it be *all* VEs, and not just those who are blind.

>This has to be a minimum burden on the candidates - can't expect them to make
>their answers in braille, for example.

And we the blind don't expect them to, no more than blind teachers expect their students to give answers in braille. There are alternative techniques enough, and there is ingenuity enough to create a comfortable testing atmosphere for the candidates and the VEs as well, be *any* of them sighted or blind.

>

>bill wb9ivr

>

73 to All, and Have a Great Weekend!

--

David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu

Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will NEVER go back!
 ** Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 21:12:12 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ncar!elmore@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQOI PRB-1 Loss
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun11.161938.13781@leland.Stanford.EDU> paulf@umunhum.stanford.edu (Paul Flaherty) writes:

```
-- previous inclusion deleted --
>No, that's not what we're suggesting.  I suggest that NQOI lost because he
>failed to take advantage of a reasonable compromise, which is mandated by
>PRB-1 (just *read* the written decision, it's in there).  PRB-1 was meant to
>keep such compromises from reaching the reducto ab adsurdum conclusion that
>you mention.  Unfortunately, because it has not been used for such purposes,
>it's now, as you indicate, full of holes as precedent.
>
>There are plenty of antenna systems that will outperform monoband beams on
>top of large towers.  However, you can't buy them as premade appliances.
```

This implies that NQOI may not be willing to "roll hia own". Knowing the guy, I can assure that 'tain't so. Now, note this carefully: NQOI was *NEVER! OFFERED* the now-famous "60' Compromise". It was *proposed* by the planning board to the Commissioners. They declined to offer it to him. IT WAS NEVER LAID ON THE TABLE AS AN OPTION BY THE COMMISSIONERS. In fact, the *Commissioners* NEVER offered any kind of compromise. All that was ever offered, either privately or publicly was 35'. Careful reading will reveal this in the judgement.

Kim Elmore, [N50P, PP ASEL/Glider 2232456]

[illegible]

Date: 11 Jun 1993 21:56:39 -0500
From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!gerald@cc.utexas.edu!thumper@cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: The Case in Question
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jon Gatnell wrote in article # 1568:

>

>

>Sure, Sure.... Like running a drug peddling and kiddie porn ring, right? C'mon,
>this is a SOCIETY, and we've gotta work TOGETHER. The only good thing about
>social darwinists is that they are dying out as a result of natural selection.
>

I made the rash assumption that people would realize that I meant that people should be allowed to do as they wish with their own property as long as that doesn't harm anyone else. I had no idea that I'd have to spell this out, but aparantly I do. So there you are.

And c'mon yourself, Jon. If you disagree with me then do so. There's no need to attempt to link me with kiddie porn and illegal drugs. And please don't confuse individualism with anarchism. They're two different things.

73 to Everyone!

David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will NEVER go back!
** Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **

--

David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will NEVER go back!
** Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 93 21:15:17 GMT

From: swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!wupost!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun10.232329.17773@ncar.ucar.edu>,
<1993Jun11.051940.3729@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Jun11.165555.4087@ncar.ucar.edu>p.Stan
Subject : Re: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case

In article <1993Jun11.165555.4087@ncar.ucar.edu> elmore@rap.ucar.edu (Kim Elmore) writes:

> Must he? To be completely up front, there was originally

>another amateur involved who had irritated his neighbors.

There have been a number of similar instances in the past, and there really isn't a legal remedy for having to follow in the footsteps of a jerk. This virtually mandates a long, slow political process.

> Ah! But this *ISN'T* in an incorporated area! It's in
>non-incorporated Boulder County. Covenants were allowed to expire by
>the neighborhood organization some significant period (2 years??
>something like that) before all of this.

Interesting. In most states, the county planning commission doesn't have that kind of standing. Out of interest, is this just the case in Boulder, or is the entire state so embued?

> Funny you should mention this. He decided that perhaps
>rhombics would be a better idea, and so petitioned for 4 35' supports
>for the rhombics. Boulder turned him down flat.

I'll need to look back at the decision again, but doesn't it say that the commission's power to regulate begins at 35 feet?

Even if it does, however, THIS decision is the one that should have been challenged in court, especially since you can't see the wire of the antenna from more than 100 feet away. There are also several similar structures of acceptance (power or phone lines), assuming you don't have buried service. Finally, as a separate ruling, it has sufficient standing to be challenged apart from the tower ruling.

> Actually, no compromises were *EVER* offered by the County.

That certainly didn't come through in the appellate decision, which claims that such an offer was made. Sounds like an error.

There are basically two issues here: 1) Is 125' a technically sound request, and 2) was a reasonably balanced compromise attempted. This really isn't a good forum for debating technical issues, so #1 should be taken for granted. Based on the written decision, I'm a bit skeptical as to whether #2 was done. If the decision misstates the facts, then by all means elaborate.

--

-Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 20:28:57 GMT

From: news.service.uci.edu!ttinews!calvin.tti.com!cole@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun10.160744.10341@leland.Stanford.EDU>,

<cole.186.739750617@soldev.tti.com>, <1993Jun11.154230.12536@leland.Stanford.EDU>

Subject : Re: NQ0I Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case

In article <1993Jun11.154230.12536@leland.Stanford.EDU> kellyj@leland.Stanford.EDU
(Kelly Johnson) writes:

(Kelly's thoughtful response about the rise of petty regulations was
deleted here).

>- Kelly Johnson

>AA6BE

>

>

I still stand by my contention that NQ0I's plans for a 100' tower were
unreasonable for any normal residential neighborhood, particularly one where
the view was a primary attraction. I love ham radio, but I don't expect
my neighbors to view that much metal and the necessary guy wires as a thing
of beauty.

I agree with Kelly Johnson's comments about the over-regulation of
our lives by every petty bureaucrat and dingaling homeowner's
association board member. But I believe that the "screw you, it's
my property and I'm gonna do damn well what I please no matter how
it impacts you" attitude is the root cause of these stupid
restrictions. All it takes is some macho man painting his house
chartreuse because it's his Constitutional right to do so and the rest
of us wind up having to get our paint color approved. It's no surprise to
find that some lid in Boulder poisoned the well.

However, sometimes you just have fold your tents, retreat, and go
fight another battle. NQ0I is probably going to make things a lot
harder for the guy who wants a 40 or 50-foot tower for his tribander and
Isopole.

There are a hell of a lot of people who do just fine on 160 meters
without a loaded 100' tower. It looks to me like NQ0I is a person
who wants to be the best at anything he does and doesn't want to
compromise on equipment. He may have to carry that attitude a bit
further and move someplace where he can put up a 200' tower and
nobody even notices or cares. This six-year legal battle has got
to have cost enough to buy a big chunk of land somewhere. It

sounds like this case has taken on a life of its own.

I can guarantee that I don't have a perfect understanding of NQ0I's long battle. The local officials probably did act unreasonably. That's a fact of life almost everywhere. But maybe the original poster shouldn't have included the written opinion, because it sounded fair to me.

Randy Cole
KN6W

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 22:33:09 GMT
From: usc!wupost!csus.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun10.002147.25377@en.ecn.purdue.edu>,
<1993Jun11.013010.2476@ennews.eas.asu.edu>, <1993Jun11.182847.4672@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: blind VEs

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.uucp) wrote:

: That seems to be the crux of the issue, that one human being can be
: "simply an extension" of another human being. I don't think that's
: possible. I person must filter what they observe through their conscious
: and unconscious before reporting, no matter how hard they try to be
: objective. So it's really the "reader" who's proctoring the exam, and
: not the person to whom he's acting as an "appendage". The FCC requires
: the VE to proctor, and that's not who's doing it in this case.
I think the crux is whether or not an exam can be proctored by a blind
proctor. In regards to the ability of a person acting as an extension of
another it is probably a bit wide of the mark. The real point is if the
VE is willing to trust their asistant with their license. Many sightees
can't imagine such a thing, understandably. Unfortunately the blind are
required to put their LIVES in the hands of others much more frequerntly
than you and I are. Would you place your life in the paws of a seeing eye
dog? Well the dog must interpret the surrounings through their concious
and unconcious and the results of failure can be much worse than \$8000 and
license revokation. When my friend Linda's dog made this mistake it cost
her three months in the hospital and the dog it's life.

: Note that I have no problem with VEs who are blind. The problem is
: that the FCC wants sighted proctors, and proctoring has almost nothing
: to do with amateur radio. The only reason the FCC wants licensed
: proctors is so they have a hold on them through their licenses.

The military had a similar saying in Viet Nam:

"Grab em by the license and their hearts and minds are sure to follow"
:-)

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102              *
*                    Davis CA 95616                             *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!             *
*-----*
```

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 22:22:58 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!
ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun8.165024.22139@ke4zv.uucp>, <C8DDzH.Au6@ucdavis.edu>,
<1993Jun10.002147.25377@en.ecn.purdue.edu>5
Subject : Re: blind VEs

Scott A Stambaugh (n9ljx@en.ecn.purdue.edu) wrote:
: In article <C8DDzH.Au6@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D.
Todd) writes:

: >The sighted VE is not required to understand all that they observe either
: >as far as I know. Is there a section of 4b that requires the
: >understanding of cheating techniques? What the VE is required to know,
: >IMHO, is the rules as they apply to teh examinees and the process. If
: >there is any activity that the reader has reason to beleive is
: >questionable they can alert the VE and s/he can take the appropriate
: >action.
: >

: Here is the point that I have a problem with. It is the READER who is making
: the judgements as to what is questionable. The READER is not certified as a
: VE. It is the READER who is doing the OBSERVING, not the VE. Unless the
: reader is able to convey ALL activity in the room to the VE, the VE will not
: be able to OBSERVE the activities and take appropriate action on the
: activities that the VE deems in appropriate.

Please reread my poost above I am very clear that since there is no
requirement of sightees to be competent in determining what is or

suspicious cheating behaviour why is that limitation placed on blind VE's?

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102             *
*                    Davis CA 95616                           *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 22:36:26 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!csus.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!
othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1v87g8\$3m@techbook.techbook.com>, <1v94cn\$c06@ni.umd.edu>,
<1va56b\$135@gopher.cs.uofs.edu>
Subject : Re: Buying radios without a license

Bill Gunshannon (bill@polygon.cs.uofs.edu) wrote:
: In article <1v94cn\$c06@ni.umd.edu>, louie@sayshell.umd.edu (Louis A. Mamakos)
writes:
: |> In article <1v87g8\$3m@techbook.techbook.com> genew@techbook.techbook.com
(Gene Wolford) writes:
: |>
: |> >Just try to beat off a mugger with that rubber duck! :-}
: |>
: |> Do not underestimate the ability of a Motorola HT-220 to put a dent in
: |> your head when weilded by its rubber duck. And afterwards, you can
: |> use it to call for assistance.

: Call for assistance for who??

: You or the guy who was hit on the head with the HT-220?? :-)
The guy you hit, but wait until he stops breathing or you won't be sure
he really neds help.

Does anyone have the 15 shot mod for the HT-220-9mm?
:-)

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102             *
*                    Davis CA 95616                           *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

Date: Fri, 11 Jun 1993 18:28:47 GMT

From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C8DDzH.Au6@ucdavis.edu>, <1993Jun10.002147.25377@en.ecn.purdue.edu>,
<1993Jun11.013010.2476@ennews.eas.asu.edu>

Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)

Subject : Re: blind VEs

In article <1993Jun11.013010.2476@ennews.eas.asu.edu> shandrow@enuxva.eas.asu.edu
(Darrell B Shandrow) writes:

>Actually, you are absolutely correct about readers. The reader doesn't
>make those judgements on his/her own. Rather, the blind person gives the
>reader instructions on what is and isn't permitted in the testing session
>and if those rules are not followed to the letter the blind person is
>notified. So, you see, the reader is simply an extension of the blind VE.

That seems to be the crux of the issue, that one human being can be
"simply an extension" of another human being. I don't think that's
possible. I person must filter what they observe through their conscious
and unconscious before reporting, no matter how hard they try to be
objective. So it's really the "reader" who's proctoring the exam, and
not the person to whom he's acting as an "appendage". The FCC requires
the VE to proctor, and that's not who's doing it in this case.

Note that I have no problem with VEs who are blind. The problem is
that the FCC wants sighted proctors, and proctoring has almost nothing
to do with amateur radio. The only reason the FCC wants licensed
proctors is so they have a hold on them through their licenses.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary

Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #185
